

## INTERNATIONAL CITY MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION

1313 EAST 60TH STREET - CHICAGO 37, ILLINOIS

This report was prepared in response to an inquiry from a municipality subscribing to this Service and is distributed to all subscribers. The contents may not be reproduced without permission.

Route To: \_\_\_\_\_

Return To: \_\_\_\_\_

### FINANCING SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

#### What should be the policy of a city with regard to financing the construction and maintenance of sidewalks?

In most cities the initial construction as well as the repair or replacement of sidewalks is the responsibility of the abutting property owner. There is a trend, however, toward municipal responsibility for defective sidewalks and for this reason cities in some states are assuming more responsibility for the actual construction and repair of sidewalks except in new subdivisions. The purpose of this report is to review current practices and to make some suggestions that may be useful to officials in developing a sidewalk policy.

The adoption of a policy on sidewalk construction and maintenance involves an analysis of special assessment laws and ordinances and laws relating to responsibility for defective walks; adoption of subdivision regulations requiring the installation of sidewalks in new areas by the subdivider; and adoption of regulations on the construction and repair of sidewalks with reference to width of sidewalks, setback from curb, type of material to be used, construction and inspection by the city, use of standard specifications for construction, and method of financing the work.

Need for Sidewalks. The unprecedented boom in residential building and the need to protect pedestrians from traffic hazards is bringing the sidewalk question to the front in many cities. Some homeowners for aesthetic or other reasons would prefer to use sidewalk space for lawn and flowers. Most citizens, however, look upon sidewalks as an accepted and essential appurtenance to public urban property. Sidewalks generally enhance the value of the property.

One of the most important reasons for sidewalks is the safety of pedestrians. When a pedestrian is injured in an accident in an area where there are no sidewalks, a group of citizens or a local improvement association immediately petitions the council to construct a sidewalk. During 1950 approximately 1,000 children four years of age or less were traffic fatalities, according to the National Safety Council, and sidewalks might have saved many of these lives. Motor vehicle accidents account for the largest number of deaths among pre-school children as a group, according to the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, and almost all of these involve a child in the street. The lack of a sidewalk on which children can play is undoubtedly a contributing factor in many of these cases.

Pedestrians at both ends of life's age span are particularly susceptible to traffic hazards. The 1950 census shows that these two groups have been increasing in numbers and proportion. More than one-tenth of the population is now under five years of age, a larger proportion than at any time since 1920. The past ten years has seen a 24 per cent increase in school children of five to nine years of age. Seven and one-half per cent of the total U. S. population is 65 years of age or older, almost double the percentage at the turn of the century. Thus the provision of sidewalks is of increasing importance for the young and old.

(Over)



General Practice. Cities generally have authority to construct and repair sidewalks, using one or more methods: (1) construction by the city out of general revenues, (2) require the owner of abutting property to construct sidewalks at his own expense, (3) the city does the construction work and assesses all or a portion of the cost of the work against the abutting property owner. Many cities use the second method, and if the property owner does not complete the improvement within a specified time the work is done by the city and the cost assessed against the property.

Some cities have adopted ordinances declaring it to be the duty of owners, occupants, or users of property abutting upon streets to maintain sidewalks in proper repair at their own expense, to allow no oils, greases, ice, snow, or water to collect or remain on the sidewalks, and to keep sidewalks in safe and adequate condition so that they are easily accessible to and may be freely and safely used by the public for travel by foot. Ordinances also state that if violation of any such provisions results in injury to any person, the liability for such injury rests upon the owner, occupant, or user of the abutting property. (Detailed data on who constructs sidewalks and method of financing is presented later in this report.)

Construction Methods. Cities generally provide that no person shall construct or repair any sidewalk except in accordance with the line, grade, and specifications established by the city, and also that no person shall permit any sidewalk which adjoins property owned by him to fall into a state of disrepair or be unsafe. It is generally the responsibility of the city to determine when a sidewalk is unsafe for use and to notify the property owner of the unsafe condition, giving him a specified time to place the sidewalk in safe condition.

When the owner fails to repair the sidewalk within the specified time, the city generally proceeds with the work and assesses the cost against the property. The ordinance should give the city authority to dispense with the notice and time limit if in the opinion of the proper official the unsafe sidewalk condition requires immediate repair.

Some decades ago it was general practice for the city to permit property owners individually to provide for the construction of sidewalks. But cities have gradually denied the property owner the opportunity to construct his separate unit of the sidewalk system. Experience has shown that such decentralized operation is more costly to both the property owner and to the city. The owner does not get the advantage of large-scale construction and the cost to the city, because of more engineering and inspection work, is increased. Construction by property owners often produced an unsightly condition through lack of uniformity.

Many cities are faced with building sidewalks in newly built up areas of the city or in annexed areas, and also with rebuilding or repairing sidewalks in the older sections. Construction of new homes is found chiefly in outlying fringe areas and the city should require the developer to install sidewalks. In the older parts of many cities sidewalks are in a bad state of disrepair because of lack of a sidewalk repair program. For example, Dallas, Texas, has recently adopted a sidewalk repair program under which the city will furnish the labor and equipment and the property owners will pay for the material. Many sidewalks in the city are in need of repair and the sidewalk repair program is to be started in order to reduce pedestrian accidents.

Sidewalks in residential areas should be a minimum of four feet wide and set back a minimum of three feet if there are no trees and seven feet if there are trees in the parkway, according to a report of the National Committee for Traffic Safety



which appears in the 1950 edition of "Traffic Engineering Handbook" (Institute of Traffic Engineers and Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 1950). Officials of cities in the snow belt believe that the walk should be set back more than three feet.

Sidewalks should be laid according to specifications adopted by the city and the department in charge of construction should provide good inspection by competent inspectors. When the city receives competitive bids on repair jobs in a particular area of the city, the city should be allowed to submit bids along with the contractors. The part of the cost that is billed to property owners should be based on exact cost records and the billing should be done promptly upon completion of the work. Detailed specifications for concrete sidewalks, including one- and two-course sidewalks, have been prepared by the American Public Works Association (Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction 1937, Section C-1, 10pp.)

In some cities where sidewalks have to be rebuilt, the city notifies property owners of the need for the work, the approximate time it will be done, how it will be financed, and that the city will do the work. Property owners are advised at the same time regarding the special assessment procedure--holding of hearings, method of paying their share, and so on--if that method of financing is used. Wherever possible it is preferable for the city to do the work on force account or to contract for the construction of long stretches of sidewalks instead of letting property owners do the work. By advertising for bids for constructing many sidewalks at the same time, the city should get a lower price than if the individual hired his own contractor.

With regard to construction costs, a survey made by the New York State Conference of Mayors in 1947 showed that the average cost of sidewalks laid in 1947, including base but excluding excavation and embankments, and including the cost of removing old material, was from 50 to 60 cents per square foot in Syracuse, Utica, and Watertown; 60 cents in Mt. Vernon and Rome; and 40 to 50 cents in Jamestown, Corning, and Binghamton--these prices being for concrete sidewalks in most places.

Liability for Damages. When the city is liable for damages due to failure to care for and maintain a sidewalk in a reasonably safe condition, the city should if possible under the law impose such liability upon the abutting property owner. It is generally considered that because a city controls sidewalks it is liable for unsafe conditions. But where there has not been affirmative negligence by the city, the duty of the abutting property owner to care and maintain for his own sidewalk for which he has paid the costs should be placed upon him. It should be stated, however, that many officials believe that if the city does the sidewalk construction and repair work the city should assume responsibility for damages in injury cases.

A survey by the Governmental Research Institute, Inc., Hartford, Conn., in July, 1951, among 36 cities over 100,000 shows that 20 cities acknowledge liability for both icy and defective walks, three for only defective walks, and seven are not liable in either case (six other cities not reporting). Average total claims, exclusive of Hartford, paid in 1948 by seven cities was \$10,493, in 1949 by eight cities \$6,926, and in 1950 by 10 cities \$12,727; claims paid by Hartford averaged eight times the latter figure.

Financing Methods. The Committee on Sidewalks of the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences in 1940 recommended that the cost of sidewalk construction should be borne (1) by the abutting property owner alone where the sidewalk is distinctly of local benefit, and (2) by all property owners in the benefitted area where the sidewalk is used by residents of that area. The committee cited a modification of the first plan as follows: Where there is a real



estate development along a major highway many residences would be built on lots not abutting the highway and thus increase the amount of pedestrian traffic along the thoroughfare and make sidewalks desirable. These sidewalks should be installed at the expense of the subdivider, or if they are provided later they should be assessed against the entire area rather than against the lots immediately abutting the roadway.

The procedure in assessing and distributing the cost of sidewalk construction depends upon state laws and city charters and for this reason the procedures vary greatly. It has long been the practice for most cities to defray the cost of sidewalk construction by special assessments. In Massachusetts and New Hampshire, for example, state law limits the amount of the special assessment to 50 per cent of the total cost, while in Virginia the practice varies among cities and ranges from one-third of the cost to the full cost, the most common arrangement being one-half of the cost. Likewise in Washington, D. C., the property owner pays only one-half of the cost of sidewalk construction.

During the depression of the 1930's the volume of special assessment work on sidewalks fell off tremendously and much of this kind of work was done under WPA or other grants-in-aid type of work which upset the older procedures. Since the second world war, however, the trend has been back toward the use of special assessment financing. The committee on special assessments of the Municipal Finance Officers Association in 1940 recommended that all sidewalk construction of standard width should be financed by special assessments and assessed exclusively against abutting property owners on a front foot basis (Municipal Finance, August 1940, pp. 48-53).

Most city officials agree that the cost of sidewalk construction should be assessed against those who benefit, but there is a difference of opinion in the apportioning of the benefits among the abutting property owner, adjacent property owner, and the general public. Since it obviously is not practical to assign the benefits on each project, it is advisable to set up standards which can be followed locally by arbitrarily assigning a percentage of total benefits according to the type of area in which the sidewalk is located and then assessing the cost accordingly. For example, the benefits for sidewalks along various types of streets may be stated as follows:

A. Local residential urban streets

- (a) The abutter has a safe and convenient walkway for himself and family going to and from the neighbors, the corner bus or streetcar stop, and the nearest store, church or school. His children have a safe place to play, skate and bicycle. The abutter received protection against pedestrians walking on his lawn or yard.
- (b) The adjacent property owner received practically none of the above benefits. Some slight benefit accrues due to improvement and attractiveness of the area as a place in which to live and due to less interruption to movements of his car.
- (c) The general public received about the same as A(b).

B. Commercial or business district streets

- (a) The abutter is benefited by the fact that his place of business is made more accessible and attractive to customers. Also he has a convenient and safe walkway to neighboring offices and stores.



- (b) The adjacent property owner is benefited, perhaps to a lesser extent than the abutter, by better access to the commercial area and a greater attractiveness of the general area as a place to live in.
- (c) The general public is benefited, probably to a lesser extent than adjacent residents, by having a convenient walkway to use after arrival at the commercial area via transit or auto.

C. Major urban non-business streets (such as state highways)

- (a) The abutter receives A(a) benefits.
- (b) The adjacent property owner receives a portion of A(a) benefits, more so than A(b) because on a major street there are likely to be more points of pedestrian destination such as bus and streetcar stops, corner stores, restaurants, etc.
- (c) The general public receives perhaps as much benefit as the abutter, at least as much as the adjacent property owner since flow of buses, autos and trucks is subject to less interruption and hazard. Also the safety and convenience of sidewalks make the general area a more desirable place in which to live.

The percentage of total benefits for each of the above three types of streets may be assessed as follows:

Location of Sidewalk	(a) Abutting Property Owner	(b) Adjacent Property Owner	(c) General Public
A. Local residential urban street	85%	10%	5%
B. Business street	60%	25%	15%
C. Major urban non-business street	60%	20%	20%

It is almost universal practice for cities that have subdivision regulations to require the developer to pay the cost of installing sidewalks. Sidewalks generally must be installed prior to the approval of the final plat or in lieu of actual completion the subdivider may file a surety bond with the city to assure that actual construction will be done in a manner satisfactory to the city within the period specified. In Wichita, Kansas, for example, the subdivision regulations require that sidewalks shall be constructed along officially designated major streets and along one side of minor streets in new subdivisions.

A Survey of Current Practice. A survey of current practice shows that the abutting property owner generally is assessed for the entire cost of the sidewalk. Some cities, counties, and states share the cost with the abutter, while in a lesser number of cases the city, county, or state pays the entire cost. A common practice is for the city to pay for the sidewalks at intersections and in front of public property, assessing abutters the complete cost only of the portion of the



sidewalk directly fronting on the properties assessed. Some cities split the costs of such sidewalks at intersections, alleys, and public property among the adjacent abutters.

Perhaps the most significant difference between the theoretical approach suggested previously and actual practice is the complete absence in the latter of the "adjacent property owner" as a classification for taxing purposes. Invariably the cost is paid by the abutting property owner or the general taxpayer or both.

Data from 11 states, obtained in a questionnaire survey in the spring of 1951, reveal the following practices regarding financing sidewalk construction in 312 cities:

	Abutter Pays 100% in	Abutter and Gen'l Taxpayer Share Cost in	State or County Pays 100% in
Local residential streets	220 cities	73 cities	19 cities
Business district streets	220 cities	73 cities	19 cities
Urban state roads	16 cities	1 city	1 city

General practice on a state-wide basis in 12 states was reported as follows:

Local residential streets (incorporated areas) -- The abutter pays 100 per cent in: California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota; Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. The abutter and general taxpayer share in: Kansas (sometimes in third class cities), Tennessee (sometimes), Washington (sometimes). General taxpayer pays 100 per cent in: Tennessee (sometimes).

Business district streets (incorporated) -- The abutter pays 100 per cent in: California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, and Wisconsin. The abutter and general taxpayer share in: Tennessee (sometimes). General taxpayer pays 100 per cent in: Tennessee (sometimes).

Urban state roads (incorporated) -- The abutter pays 100 per cent in: Colorado, Kansas, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Washington, and Wisconsin. The abutter and general taxpayer share in: Washington (sometimes). The general taxpayer pays 100 per cent in Montana and Tennessee, and in Texas on interregional highways or freeways.

In Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and in Nebraska and Oregon cities sidewalks are required adjacent to schools or other places where needed for safety and abutters are assessed 100 per cent whether they want the sidewalks or not. In Florida cities the property owner generally constructs the sidewalk but on rebuilding or repairing the sidewalk the owner usually buys material and the city does the work. The city has to inspect sidewalks as the city is liable for damages. Some Florida officials feel that the owner should be liable as he would then inspect and report on sidewalks that need repair.

A number of municipal officials in Pennsylvania have voiced the feeling that if the cities assume any more responsibility in constructing sidewalks that liability for safety of pedestrians might be shifted to the community. In Michigan a 1951 law makes cities liable for damages resulting from defective sidewalks and cities in Michigan tend to inspect and repair sidewalks at city expense.

Practice in Cities Over 100,000. In July, 1951, the Governmental Research Institute, Inc., Hartford, Connecticut, at the request of City Manager Carleton F.



Sharpe made a questionnaire survey among cities of 100,000 to 600,000 and only three of the 36 cities which responded stated that they assume any part of the initial construction costs (see table at end of report).

In 27 of the 36 cities the initial construction work is done under the direction of the owner or the city and in the nine other cities the work is done under the direction of the city. Financing of the initial construction is entirely by the property owners in 33 cities, either by the owner paying for the work directly or by the city assessing the owner for the work done under the city's supervision.

In 12 of the 36 cities the property owner is responsible for maintaining the sidewalks. In another 12 the city is responsible, and in 10 other cities the city does the work if the owner neglects to make the proper repairs after being notified to do so by the city. In the remaining two cities, Hartford and Albany, the city holds the owner responsible for the major share of the repair work but assumes responsibility for particular types of repair.

Maintenance and repair of sidewalks is financed by the abutting property owners in 25 of the 36 cities. In eight other cities the city assumes full financial responsibility for such work, and in three remaining cities (San Diego, Hartford, and Albany) the city holds the property owner responsible for most cases of large expenditures and the city does minor work at the city's expense.

With regard to the time allowed the property owner to make repairs after notification, 16 of the 36 cities allow a definite time limit ranging from 10 to 60 days, 10 have no time limit, and five allow a reasonable time depending on the courts for interpretation of this, and five cities didn't answer.

A Plan Recommended for Montgomery County, Maryland. On the basis of a survey of practices in various parts of the country as set forth in this report, Montgomery County, Md., Safety Board has developed a sidewalk financing plan which at the time this report was prepared was being considered favorably for adoption by the governing body of Montgomery County. The plan is designed for application in unincorporated and incorporated communities within the County as well as in connection with county and state roads outside the communities.

It will be noted that the "adjacent property owner" is not included in the plan, but is classed with the general taxpayer. Whereas it was recognized that he theoretically deserves special treatment in view of special benefits received which differ from those accorded to abutters and the general public, it was felt that insufficient precedent existed to support strong argument for establishment of special taxing areas or benefit districts in connection with sidewalk projects.

The plan recommended for Montgomery County follows:

"It is recognized that sidewalk construction costs should be paid by those who benefit and should be apportioned to them directly in accordance with benefit received. There are two principal groups of beneficiaries: the property owners abutting on the sidewalk, and the general public.

"Therefore it is recommended that all costs incident to sidewalk construction, except grading, where sidewalks are added in the future along existing streets, should be apportioned as follows:

- (a) Abutter pays 100 per cent and general taxpayer pays nothing on existing urban residential local streets and on existing business, commercial or industrial district streets.

(Over)



(b) Abutter pays 50 per cent and general taxpayer pays 50 per cent on existing urban residential through streets.

(c) Abutter pays nothing and general taxpayer pays 100 per cent on rural roads.

Exception: Where Montgomery County initiates and requires sidewalk construction to alleviate pedestrian hazards on any existing urban residential streets, the abutter should pay 50 per cent and the general taxpayer 50 per cent.

"Residential local streets listed under (a) above are considered to be those in areas used primarily for residential purposes, already in existence at the time that addition of sidewalks is considered, and carrying primarily local traffic.

"Streets under (b) above are identical with residential local streets except that (b) pertains to streets carrying primarily through traffic, such as state highways, arterial roads and primary outlets for residential neighborhoods.

"Business, commercial and industrial streets under (a) may be either in rural or urban areas, while (c) refers to any area not included in a business, commercial, industrial or residence district, whether or not within the boundaries of a municipality."

The above plan assesses costs completely against the abutting property owners on local streets, since the use of both street and sidewalk is principally by the local resident, or abutter.

On through streets the cost is split equally between the abutters and the highway users (general taxpayer), drivers who use the street and who come from outside the immediate area.

On rural roads practically the entire benefit accrues to vehicle users, hikers, bicyclists, etc., who come under the heading of general taxpayers, hence they are assessed the complete cost of any sidewalk.

The exception noted in the above plan is intended for local streets where unusual pedestrian hazard requires provision of a sidewalk. This case would cover needed sidewalks within normal walking distance of schools or adjacent to places of public assemblage such as churches, auditoriums, etc. The stipulation to the effect that the County must initiate the plan is intended to safeguard against abuse of this section by property owners who might fraudulently claim existence of unusual pedestrian hazards in order to gain the payment of half of the sidewalk cost by the general taxpayer.

Note: Grateful acknowledgment is made to two sources for much of the material presented in this report: (1) Henry K. Evans, highway transportation specialist, Transportation and Communication Department, Chamber of Commerce of United States, Washington, D. C., who, as chairman of the engineering committee of the Safety Board of Montgomery County, Md., made a survey of practices throughout the country in the spring of 1951 and prepared a report outlining a plan for sidewalk financing for Montgomery County; and (2) Leslie M. Gravlin, director, Governmental Research Institute, Inc., Hartford, Conn., for permission to use in this report information compiled by the Institute in July, 1951, on the practices in certain cities of more than 100,000 population, including the table giving detailed data for 36 cities appended to this report.



SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR POLICIES IN 36 CITIES OF MORE THAN  
100,000 POPULATION

C I T Y	I N I T I A L C O N S T R U C T I O N						City Is	
	Actual Construction By:			Method of Financing			Liable for	
	City	City	Owner	City	City	Owner	Damages from	
	Under Contract			Assesses Owner	Assumes Cost	Pays Contract	Sidewalks	
							Which Are:	
						Directly	Icy	Defective
Sacramento, Calif.		X	X	X		X	Yes	Yes
San Diego, Calif.			X			X	NR	NR
Denver, Colo.*		X	X	X		X	Yes	Yes
Hartford, Conn.			X			X	Yes	Yes
New Haven, Conn.			X			X	Yes	Yes
Waterbury, Conn.*		X		1/2 Cost	1/2 Cost		Yes	Yes
Peoria, Ill.		X	X	X		X	Yes	Yes
Gary, Ind.*		X		X			No	No
Des Moines, Iowa*	X		X	X		X	Yes	Yes
Fall River, Mass.*		X		1/2 Cost	1/2 Cost		No	Yes
Lowell, Mass.			X			X	NR	NR
New Bedford, Mass.*	X		X	X		X	Yes	Yes
Springfield, Mass.			X			X	No	Yes
Worcester, Mass.*	X	X		X	X		Yes	Yes
Detroit, Mich.*		X		X			Yes	Yes
Duluth, Minn.*		X		X			Yes	Yes
St. Paul, Minn.*		X	X	X		X	Yes	Yes
Kansas City, Mo.*		X		X			Yes	Yes
Camden, N. J.			X			X	No	No
Jersey City, N. J.			X			X	NR	NR
Newark, N. J.*		X	X	X		X	No	No
Paterson, N. J.			X			X	No	No
Trenton, N. J.			X			X	No	No
Albany, N. Y.*		X	X	X		X	Yes	Yes
Buffalo, N. Y.		X	X	X		X	Yes	Yes
Rochester, N. Y.			X			X	No	Yes
Schenectady, N. Y.*			X			X	Yes	Yes
Syracuse, N. Y.	X		X	X		X	NR	NR
Dayton, Ohio*		X	X	X		X	Yes	Yes
Erie, Penn.			X			X	No	No
Reading, Penn.			X			X	No	No
Scranton, Penn.		X	X	X		X	NR	NR
Providence, R. I.			X			X	Yes	Yes
Norfolk, Va.*		X		X			Yes	Yes
Richmond, Va.*		X	X	X		X	NR	NR
Tacoma, Wash.*		X		X			Yes	Yes

NOTE: NR - Not reported; R.T. - Reasonable time.  
Asterisks (\*) refer to individual city footnotes on page 575.

(Over)



## SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR POLICIES (Continued)

C I T Y	MAINTENANCE, REPLACEMENT AND REPAIRS						
	Actual Work Done By:			Method of Financing			Time Limit on Repairs to
	City	City Under Contract	Owner	City Assesses Owner	City Assumes Cost	Owner Pays Contract Directly	
Sacramento, Calif.*		X	X	X		X	10 days
San Diego, Calif.*	X		X		X	X	NR
Denver, Colo.*	X		X	X		X	10 days
Hartford, Conn.*	X	X	X	X	X	X	35 days
New Haven, Conn.			X			X	30 days
Waterbury, Conn.*	X				X		None
Peoria, Ill.			X			X	NR
Gary, Ind.			X			X	NR
Des Moines, Iowa*	X		X	X		X	R.T.
Fall River, Mass.*		X			X		None
Lowell, Mass.	X				X		None
New Bedford, Mass.*	X			X			None
Springfield, Mass.*	X				X		None
Worcester, Mass.*	X				X		None
Detroit, Mich.*	X	X		X			10 days
Duluth, Minn.*	X				X		None
St. Paul, Minn.*		X	X	X		X	R.T.
Kansas City, Mo.*	X			X			10 days
Camden, N.J.			X			X	35 days
Jersey City, N.J.			X			X	10 days
Newark, N.J.*		X	X	X		X	30 days
Paterson, N.J.			X			X	R.T.
Trenton, N.J.			X			X	30 days
Albany, N.Y.*	X	X	X	X	X	X	10 days
Buffalo, N.Y.		X	X	X		X	60 days
Rochester, N.Y.			X			X	R.T.
Schenectady, N.Y.			X			X	NR
Syracuse, N.Y.	X		X	X		X	NR
Dayton, Ohio*		X	X	X		X	15 days
Erie, Penn.			X			X	10 days
Reading, Penn.			X			X	None
Scranton, Penn.		X	X	X		X	R.T.
Providence, R.I.			X			X	30 days
Norfolk, Va.*	X				X		None
Richmond, Va.*	X				X		None
Tacoma, Wash.*		X		X			60 days

SOURCE: Sidewalk survey questionnaire sent by Governmental Research Institute, Inc., Hartford, Conn., July, 1951.



SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR SURVEY FOOTNOTES  
(Cities in alphabetical order)

- Albany, N.Y.-assessment for construction due in 5 years (10 years if in connection with street and sewer construction), for repairs, immediately or placed on tax rolls. City assumes cost of walk repairs only for resurfacing or for damage due to trees.
- Dayton, Ohio - assessment for construction due in 30 days or 10 yearly payments, repairs due in 1 year if under \$25; \$25-\$100, in 5 years, \$100 or over, in 10 years.
- Denver, Colo.-payment for construction of walks in special assessment district total in 30 days or 12 yearly payments; repairs where curb, gutter and walk construction is combined, are split 50-50 by City and owner.
- Des Moines, Ia.-owner pays assessments for construction and repair of walks in 7 years.
- Detroit, Mich.-payment of assessments due in approximately 60 days.
- Duluth, Minn.-assessments under \$15, due immediately, over \$15, 1/4 in 30 days, balance in 5 yearly payments. City expense for repairs 1948-\$7,477, 1949-\$6,625, 1950-\$4,114.
- Fall River, Mass.-owner pays 1/2 of estimated cost in advance. City's share of walk construction 1948-\$14,485, 1949-\$17,329, 1950-\$14,742. City's expenditures for repairs to walks 1948-\$17,639, 1949-\$26,544, 1950-\$25,655.
- Gary, Ind.-owner pays assessment for initial construction in 10 years.
- Hartford, Conn.-city will maintain new concrete walks which meet specifications.
- Kansas City, Mo.-assessment for construction due in 4 years, repairs due in 1 year.
- Newark, N.J.-assessments for construction or repairs due in five yearly installments.
- New Bedford, Mass.-payments for construction and repair of walks due in 30 days.
- Norfolk, Va.-assessments for construction due immediately or in 5 yearly payments at 6%. City expenditures for repairs 1948-\$14,722, 1949-\$31,902, 1950-\$27,623.
- Richmond, Va.-assessment for construction due with next property tax. City expenditures for sidewalk repairs 1948-49, \$5,150, 1949-50, \$43,030.
- Sacramento, Calif.-construction costs financed over 10-15 years, repairs due in 15 days.
- St. Paul, Minn.-construction assessment due in 5 years at 6%. Repairs assessment if under \$10 - one payment, all others due in 5 years at 6%.
- San Diego, Calif.-repairs under 25 sq. ft. handled by city at no cost to owner; areas slightly over 25 sq. ft., owner supplies the material, the city, the labor; more extensive repairs must be done entirely by the property owner.
- Schenectady, N.Y.-city liable in icy sidewalk cases only after 24 hours notification.
- Springfield, Mass.-city expenses for repairs 1948-\$7,689, 1949-\$11,823.
- Tacoma, Wash.-assessment for construction due in 5 years at 4%, for repairs, under \$50-in 30 days, \$50-\$100, 1/2 in 30 days, bal. in 1 year, over \$100, 1/5 in 30 days, bal. in 4 yearly payments.
- Waterbury, Conn.-1/2 of owner's share due in 150 days, second 1/2 in next 150 days. City's share of new walk construction 1948-\$40,122, 1949-\$16,678, 1950-\$20,949. Walk repairs cost City \$12,131-1949, \$16,243, 1950.
- Worcester, Mass.-walk construction in connection with private street acceptance, payment for total assessment due in 10 years. Walk construction and repair along public streets done by the City. Construction expense 1948-\$65,784, 1949-\$52,930, 1950-\$50,284. Repair expense 1948-\$23,764, 1949-\$14,390, 1950-\$21,283. City liable for icy walks only in combination with defective sidewalks.



